



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/666,910	09/21/2000	Anna Maria Zara	10002185-1	7529

7590 05/06/2003

Hewlett Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
PO Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599

EXAMINER

BORISSOV, IGOR N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3629

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/666,910

Applicant(s)

ZARA ET AL.

Examiner

Igor Borissov

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phaal (US 6,055,564) in view of Degenaro et al. (US 6,341,369).

Phaal teaches a method and apparatus for admission control where priority indicator is used to discriminate between messages, comprising:

As per claims 1 and 9,

- receiving an access request in the application system from the server system, wherein the access request is requesting the application system to perform an externally requested transaction and to generate a response for the request (Abstract; column 2, lines 25-42; column 4, lines 45 through column 5, line 16);
- generating a tag containing the classification information (Abstract; column 2, lines 27-57);
- sending the tag to a requesting client that issued the request such that the tag is attached to subsequent external requests to the data service system for the same transaction (column 2, lines 27-57; column 8, lines 30-34);

- scheduling requests to be serviced by the server system based on the classification information contained in the tag of each of the subsequent external requests (column 2, lines 27-57; column 3, line 64 through column 4, line 3).

However, Phaal does not specifically teach storing business rules regarding classification of various transactions, and using the business rules to obtain the classification information of the transactions.

Degenaro et al. teach a method and apparatus for specifying and applying rules to classification-based decision points in an application system, wherein a set of business rules regarding classification of various transactions is used to obtain the classification information of the transaction (Abstract; column 3, lines 58-63).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Phaal to include use of a set of business rules regarding classification of various transactions to obtain the classification information of the transaction, because it would make the system more versatile, thereby make it more attractive for the customers.

As per claim 2, Degenaro et al. teach said method and apparatus wherein the tag generator causes the business rule engine to analyze the response with the business rules stored in the business rule engine to determine classification of the transaction such that subsequent requests that are part of the same transaction do not need to be classified again (Abstract; column 3, lines 58-63; column 5, line 14 through column 7, line 57).

As per claims 3 and 11, Degenaro et al. teach said method and apparatus wherein the tag generator causes the business rule engine to re-apply the business rules to responses for the

subsequent requests to determine if reclassification is needed for the subsequent requests (Abstract; column 3, lines 58-63; column 5, line 14 through column 7, line 57).

As per claims 4 and 12, Phaal teaches said method and apparatus wherein the tag is updated if the tag generator determines that reclassification is needed (column 2, lines 57-67).

As per claims 5 and 13, Phaal teaches said method and apparatus wherein the server system attaches the tag into the response by placing the tag (1) in a cookie, (2) in the body of the response message, or (3) in a URL of the response (column 10, lines 16-35).

As per claims 6 and 10, Phaal teaches said method and apparatus wherein the step of scheduling requests further comprises parsing each of the requests to determine if the request is for an existing transaction or for a new transaction; and if the request is for a new transaction, assigning a default tag to the request (column 2, lines 15-16, 58-67).

As per claim 7, Phaal teaches said method and apparatus wherein the server system is a TCP/IP-based server application system (column 1, lines 17-33).

As per claim 8, Phaal teaches said method and apparatus wherein the server system is one of a web server system, an e-mail server system, a news server system, an e-commerce server system, a proxy server system, a domain name server system, and a local service server system (column 4, lines 52-54).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 03/24/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Degenaro et al. do not disclose classification of customer requests, Examiner stipulates that Degenaro et al. teach a method and apparatus for

specifying and applying rules to classification-based decision points in an application system, wherein a set of business rules regarding classification of various transactions is used to obtain the classification information of the transaction (Abstract; column 3, lines 58-63; column 5, line 14 through column 7, line 57). The only differences found here are in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited.

Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); (MPEP 2106).

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

#### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Igor Borissov at telephone number (703) 305-4649.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, John Weiss, can be reached at (703) 308- 2702.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:


***Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington D.C. 20231***

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687 [Official communications; including  
After Final communications labeled  
"Box AF"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 7<sup>th</sup> floor receptionist.

IR

  
**JOHN G. WEISS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**